## REMARKS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided generally to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

*Telephone Interview*

Applicant thanks the examiner for a telephone interview on April 12, 2007 in which the claim amendments presented above were discussed.

*Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-20, 22-29 and 31-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,807,532 ("Kolls"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,111 ("Walker"). Claim 45 was rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolls, in view of Walker, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,894 ("Katz"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that, even when viewed together, the cited references, including U.S. Patent No. 6,807,532 ("Kolls"), U.S. Patent No. 6,216,111 ("Walker") and U.S. Patent No. 6,323,894 ("Katz"), do not suggest a combination as recited in the pending claims.

Kolls discloses an advertisement which allows a user to respond to the advertisement to initiate a call to the advertiser. For example, a user can touch the advertisement displayed on a telephone to call the phone number of an advertised restaurant to speak to the restaurant host, inquire as to the wait time for a table, obtain direction and/or make a reservation (see, e.g., Col. 46, lines 20-37, Kolls).

Walker discloses a system in which a telemarketer may reward a customer during the telemarketing call to provide the customer with an incentive to listen to the telephone sales presentations (see, e.g., abstract, Walker).

Katz discloses the use of video conferencing for an interactive training session or seminar.

However, when viewed as a whole, the cited references do not suggest a particular way to facilitate the online organizing of interactive advertising seminars, in which the customers are rewarded for interactions with the advertiser over the connection for real time communications between the customer and the advertiser established through the selection of the link in the advertisement.

In Kolls, the advertisement is presented for the advertiser before the call is made to the advertiser. There is no suggestion or motivation in the cited reference to reward the customer for speaking to the restaurant host, inquire as to the wait time for a table, obtain direction and/or make a reservation, after calling the restaurant via touching the advertisement. There is no motivation to combine Kolls and Walker to force the customer to view the advertisement once on the telephone according to Kolls and then listen to a recorded sales presentation again to get the reward according to Kolls.

To address the above argument, the Office Action (page 11, lines 3-12, mailed on March 21, 2007) points to Col. 47, lines 45-65, Kolls, which discloses a survey the user can fill in by way of a touch screen and a test performed to determine if a user capable of responding to the interactive advertisement has in-fact responded to the displayed advertisement. Based on this description, the Office Action (page 11, lines 3-12, mailed on March 21, 2007) suggested the following combination: "customer would read the advertisement displayed on the Kolls' system and then answer automated questions to verify that the customer actually listened" for which the customer is rewarded based on the teaching of Walker.

However, such a combination suggested in the Office Action does not includes all the limits of the pending claims. In such a combination, the customer is rewarded for interaction with the touch screen, not for interaction with the advertiser over a connection for real time communications between the customer and the advertiser. In such a combination, the customer's phone call has nothing to do with rewarding the customer.

To the contrary, the pending claims require "compensating the one or more users based on the rate and a duration of the real time communications between the one or more users and the advertiser". Since the cited references do not suggest a combination in which the users are rewarded for real time communications over the connection that is established via the selection of the link in the advertisement, the pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

Further, the cited references do not show an advertisement presenting the rate to compensate the user to conduct the real-time communication with the advertiser and an indicia of whether the advertiser is currently available for real-time communication with the user. For example, the independent claim 1 recites:

> 1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:
>
> providing a list of advertisements to be displayed, wherein one or more of the advertisements comprise a link to be selected by a user to conduct a real time communication between the user and an advertiser, a rate to compensate the user to conduct the real-time communication with the advertiser, and an indicia of whether the advertiser is currently available for real-time communication with the user;
>
> receiving, from one or more users, a selection of the link from the list of advertisements;
>
> responsive to the selection of the link, establishing a connection for real time communications between the one or more users and the advertiser; and
>
> compensating the one or more users based on the rate and a duration of the real time communications between the one or more users and the advertiser. [emphasis added]

Thus, at least for the above reasons, the pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

The examiner suggested during the interview that U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0116266 ("Marshall") may be relevant. Marshall discussed the availability of reward.

However, Marshall does not discuss the availability of the advertiser for real-time communication with the user. Marshall does not suggest providing an indicia of such availability of the advertiser for real-time communication on an advertisement which has a link selectable to establish a connection for real-time communications.

It is noted that Marshall was filed on January 12, 2002, which is after the filing date of the present application. Marshall has 7 provisional applications. Some of the provisional applications of Marshall were filed before the filing date of the present application and some of the provisional applications of Marshall were filed after the filing date of the present application. Thus, at least a portion of the disclosure of Marshall is not prior art for the present application.

## CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 13, 2007

/John P. Ward/
John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

CUSTOMER NUMBER 64494
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
Tel: (650) 328-8500
Fax: (650) 328-8508
E-Mail: wardj@gtlaw.com